



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

after these omissions, that we are denied the thinnest thread of an index. If M. Gauthiez had seen fit to graft the historical method upon his biography, he might, without impairing the effectiveness of his art, have produced a book with a much better claim to usefulness and long life.

Like so many members of his house, like so many degenerates of all ages and nations, Lorenzino was a lover of arts and letters. He even commanded a creative vein, and left behind him two productions which are among the literary curios of the sixteenth century, a comedy, *L'Aridosia*, and an autobiographical fragment, the *Apology*. For most readers the frank matter of the *Apology* has a particular charm, and the work is rare enough to merit incorporation in a volume aspiring to present the complete Lorenzino, but with his usual irritating waywardness the author chooses to give us only the much less important *L'Aridosia* in a new translation of his own. However, as *L'Aridosia* is almost inaccessible, whether in the original or in translation, M. Gauthiez compels our gratitude for his offering, especially as the comedy fairly takes rank with the *Mandragola* of Machiavelli, and speaks more eloquently of Lorenzino's talents than a chapter of encomium.

FERDINAND SCHWILL.

*Histoire de France depuis les Origines jusqu'à la Révolution.* Publié sous la Direction de M. ERNEST LAVISSE. Tome V, Partie 2. *La Lutte contre la Maison d'Autriche. La France sous Henri II (1519-1559).* Par HENRY LEMONNIER. Tome VI, Partie 1. *La Réforme et la Ligue. L'Édit de Nantes (1559-1598).* Par JEAN H. MARIÉJOL. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1904. Pp. 380, 423.)

PART two of volume five covers the history of the conflict between France and the house of Austria from the accession of Charles V to the peace of Cateau-Cambrésis. It continues the history of French absolutism, of the growth of the French reformation into the Calvinistic system, of the development of the Renaissance into a more formal classicism.

Coinciding in its publication with the recent issue of Bishop Stubbs's lectures, numbers of which treat the same subject in broader outline, the English reader is at once struck with M. Lemonnier's estimate of Charles V. While not so unstinted in praise as that of the late bishop of Oxford, it is yet a clear and penetrating study of the history of the great emperor who too often has been represented by French historians as the gratuitous arch-enemy of France, which Francis I chivalrously sought to defend. English politics, of course, enters largely into the subject, and here M. Lemonnier seems to be unaware of the four articles of Dr. Stephan Ehses published in the *Historisches Jahrbuch* in 1888 and 1892 (IX, 28-48, 209-250, 609-649; XIII, 470-488) and of his collection of *Römische Dokumente* (Paderborn, 1893), which threw new and important light from the Vatican archives upon the divorce of Henry VIII (cf. p. 74). Dr. James Gairdner has directed English attention to the work

of Ehse in the *English Historical Review*, XI, 673-702; XII, 1-16, 237-253; XVII, 572. In the matter of institutional history, in the opinion of the reviewer, the treatment of financial questions under Francis I and Henry II is too brief and too much scattered.

In force of treatment, the latter half of the volume, dealing with the reign of Henry II and French Calvinism, is the better portion. Indeed, it is exceedingly valuable, for, as the author truly observes, there is no adequate history of the reign of Henry II; much of the documentary material yet remains unclassified. As might be expected from one whose specialty is the history of sixteenth-century art and letters, books XI and XII, dealing with the formation of the classic spirit in France, are particularly full and complete.

It is a rather sharp transition from the fifth to the sixth volume; for in both scope and policy there is a difference. Part one of the sixth volume, *La Réforme et la Ligue: l'Édit de Nantes (1559-1598)*, differs from preceding volumes of the series in that it limits the field to political and institutional history only. Unfortunately one feels in reading it that the task of writing the history of this critical period has been assigned to the wrong person. It was a principle of the common law that a child should not be given into the care of a nurse who loved it not. This principle has a certain applicability in the present case. The brilliant work already done in the field of the French Reformation by M. Henri Hauser of the University of Dijon, who in 1894 and again in 1897 lectured at the Sorbonne (cf. an article by him in the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW* for January, 1899, IV, 217-227: "The French Reformation and the French People in the Sixteenth Century") would seem to have pointed him out as the most capable person to write the volume pertaining to this period.

There is no lack of scholarship on M. Mariéjol's part, for the text bears many evidences of original research (*e. g.*, p. 56, where the K-collection of the Archives Nationales has very plainly been examined). The deficiency is a certain failure to appreciate the double nature of the struggle, a real disinclination, apparently, to look at both sides of the issue. The author assumes from the beginning that the Huguenot party was largely in the wrong and gratuitously made strife for the sake of self-advantage. The reiteration of this idea at last becomes irritating. It is a disparagement of the Huguenot party to say that it was wholly actuated by "le ressentiment d'une injure ou l'amour du changement" (p. 12). What is one to think of the statements that "En réalité, ils [les protestants] n'avaient d'autre excuse que l'intérêt religieux" (p. 69); that Coligny was playing a deep and daring game (p. 119); and that "as friend or as enemy he was equally to be feared" (p. 124)?

M. Mariéjol seems to think the distinction between the Huguenots of religion and the Huguenots of state to have been a suspicious and a specious one, and yet the distinction was fully admitted from the inception of the civil wars (Pierre de la Place, *Commentaires de l'état de la religion et de la république*, 41; Gaspard de Saulx-Tavannes, *Mémoires*, 241).

The issue raised by the former imperceptibly merged into that of the political Huguenots, who not only wanted to alter the foundations of belief but to change the institutional order of things, and who used religious opposition as a means to attack the authority of the crown. If the cause of religion was an issue, that of the state was as much so, and the two conjoined provoked a long series of civil wars. It is to be regretted that this depreciatory treatment of the Huguenot cause should prevail throughout the book, for it vitiates what otherwise is, in the main, a comprehensive survey of the history of France during the civil wars. From the inception of the Holy League in 1576, the residue of the volume (books III and IV) is an adequate account.

Exception may be taken to a number of statements which are errors of fact. On p. 8 it is said that Catherine de Médicis was the person who sent Anthony of Navarre off to Spain in the abortive hope of recovering his lost kingdom. On the contrary, the evidence is in favor of the part of the Guises in this move. With the conceit of a weak man in a prominent position, Anthony entertained schemes of his own at this time. His purpose was to play Spain and England against one another, in the hope that he might persuade Philip II to restore to him the kingdom of Navarre by a firm advocacy of Catholicism in France (which of course prevented him from affiliating with the Huguenot party to which Condé and the Châtillons were attached) or, in the event of failure in this, to side with the Huguenots and enlist English support. Shortly after his arrival at the court from Béarn, on August 23, 1559, he made overtures to Throckmorton, the English ambassador in France. After a long declaration of his affection for Elizabeth, he said that he would write to her with his own hand, for if either the Guises or the Spanish ambassador knew of it, "it would be dangerous for both and hinder their good enterprise" (August 25, 1559, *Calendar of State Papers, Elizabeth, Foreign*, I, 498). But the Guises were made aware of Navarre's doings through the treachery of a gentleman of his suite, and shrewdly schemed to rid themselves of his presence by sending him to Spain as escort for Elizabeth of France (Régner de la Planche, *Histoire de l'état de France sous François II*, I, 212-216; Gaspard de Saulx-Tavannes, 246).

The feud between the constable and the Guises over Dammartin is said (p. 9) to have grown out of the revocation by Francis II of the alienations of the royal domain made by his father, and to have begun in October, 1559. Now the Tuscan ambassador, than whom no diplomat in Paris was better informed, first makes mention of it in April, 1560. Moreover, the feud did not have relation to the king's ordinance. The duke of Guise had purchased the right of the sieur de Rambures to the county of Dammartin, not far from Paris and adjacent to that of Nanteuil, which the duke had shortly before acquired, the lower court of which was held in relief of Dammartin. In order to do so, Guise had persuaded Philippe de Boulainvilliers, who had lately sold the property to the constable, to rescind the contract which had been made and to sell it to him

(la Place, 38). But the duke met with a straight rebuff, for when he sent word of the transaction the constable answered by Damville, his son, that "as he had bought it, so would he keep it". The account of the pursuit of the Huguenots after the failure of the conspiracy of Amboise (pp. 16-18) fails to include mention of the important fact that *lettres de cachet* were issued *in blank* to the marshals and other officers, the instructions of the king being a curious monument of the fury of the Guises (*Correspondance de l'Aubespine*, 342-343). Montmorency (p. 14) is acquitted of a knowledge of the conspiracy of Amboise on his own evidence, which was so vigorously given before the parliament after the collapse of the conspiracy (cf. la Place, 37; Michel de Castelnau, *Mémoires*, bk. II, ch. 11). But, protestation aside, there is little room to doubt at least the constable's knowledge of the affair. The conspirators were in the main recruited from the Breton border, Anjou, Poitou, and Saintonge, with individual captains from Normandy, Picardy, Provence, and Languedoc. The rendezvous was at Nantes. In the early winter Montmorency had visited his lands in Poitou, Angoumois, and Buttay, having quitted his usual place of residence at Chantilly and traveled in those quarters of France which are identical with those wherein the conspiracy of Amboise was hatched (la Place, 32; la Planche, 279). Is it reasonable to believe that a man of his political acumen and state of feeling toward the Guises at the time could have been unaware of at least a portion of what was in preparation?

As has been invariably the case, the bibliographies attached to the various chapters are full and discriminating.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

*Queen Elizabeth and the Levant Company: a Diplomatic and Literary Episode of the Establishment of our Trade with Turkey.* By the Rev. H. G. ROSEDALE, M.A., D.D., F.R.S.L., Vicar of St. Peter's, Bayswater. (London and New York: Henry Frowde. 1904. Pp. xii, 91).

THE history of Anglo-Turkish relations still lacks an historian; and the affairs of the Levant or Turkey Company have not as yet received the careful study they deserve. This book, a folio published under the direction of the Royal Society of Literature, is a beautiful specimen of the printer's art and contains twenty-six plates, reproductions of rare engravings, and photographs of pages of manuscript documents; but it does not pretend to illuminate the history of English relations with the Porte, except within a most limited area and in respect to matters of no wide significance. The larger part of the volume consists of documents, at least two of which have already been printed, though the fact is not indicated. The thread of editorial explanation is slight in character and does not on the whole show a very keen appreciation of aught save antiquarian interests. Such statements as that the Janissaries are the "hereditary soldiers of Turkey" are open to comment; and the omission of